

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 CARY PETERSON,

4 Plaintiff

5 v.

6 THE SIEGEL GROUP NEVADA, INC., et
7 al.,

8 Defendants

Case No.: 2:24-cv-02265-APG-DJA

**Order Accepting Report and
Recommendation and Dismissing Case**

[ECF Nos. 17, 19]

9 On April 16, 2025, Magistrate Judge Albregts recommended that I dismiss plaintiff Cary
10 Peterson's complaint because Peterson did not comply with court orders to pay the filing fee or
11 complete an application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and to update his address. ECF
12 No. 19. Judge Albregts also recommended that I deny the plaintiff's motion to request electronic
13 access to the court because (1) the motion does not actually seek authorization as an electronic
14 filer, (2) it actually seeks a temporary restraining order, and (3) Peterson has not shown he is
15 entitled to injunctive relief. *Id.*

16 Peterson did not object, and the report and recommendation was returned in the mail.
17 ECF No. 20. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de novo review of the report and
18 recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to "make a de novo
19 determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is
20 made"); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) ("the
21 district judge must review the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations de novo *if*
22 *objection is made*, but not otherwise" (emphasis in original)).

23 ////

1 I THEREFORE ORDER that Magistrate Judge Albregts' report and recommendation
2 (ECF No. 19) is accepted and this case is dismissed without prejudice. Consequently, all
3 pending motions (ECF Nos. 9, 17) are DENIED as moot. The clerk of court is instructed to
4 close this case.

5 DATED this 2nd day of May, 2025.

6
7 

8 ANDREW P. GORDON
9 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23